

UNITED STAT DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address:

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	m 4 4 150)	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	R		ATTORNEY DOCKET	NO.	
09/360,805	07/23/99	1_[_1,111						
— HM12/1024			12/1024 _	ן ר	HOLL I NT EXAMINER			
JOHNSON & J ONE JOHNSON NEW BRUNSWI	I S. JIHNDUN	PLAZA 3-7003		[ARTUNIT	PAPER NUME	BER	
						10/24/00	Ĝ	
					DATE MAILED:			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

	Application No.		Applicant(s)					
	09/360,805 CLU		CLUM ET AL.	.UM ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit					
	Gary E Hollinden, Ph.D).	1619					
The MAILING DATE of this communication apport	ears on the cover sheet	with the co	rrespondence a	ddress				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	Y IS SET TO EXPIRE	3 MONTH(S) FROM					
Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this commun. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) da be considered timely. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutor communication. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, IStatus.	ncation. ys, a reply within the statutor y period will apply and will e	y minimum of xpire SIX (6) N	thirty (30) days will	nailing date of this				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22	<u>May 2000</u> .							
<u> </u>	his action is non-final.							
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Disposition of Claims								
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>16-63</u> is/are pending in the application	on.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	awn from consideratior	1.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.								
7) Claim(s) <u>16-63</u> is/are objected to.								
8) Claims are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement							
Application Papers								
9) The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner.							
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected				•				
11) The proposed drawing correction filed on		b) disap	proved.					
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the B								
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119								
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	an priority under 35 U.S	S.C. δ 119(a	a)-(d).					
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of the CERTI				:				
1. received.	d = 10 = d = 1 No							
2. received in Application No. (Series Co			(DOT Dot- 47.0	(a))				
received in this National Stage applicat				(a)).				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis								
14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for don	nestic priority under 35	U.S.C. & 1	19(e).					
Attachment(s)								
15) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 16) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 17) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s	19) 🔲 No	tice of Informa	ary (PTO-413) Pape al Patent Application					
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 3-98) Office	Action Summary		Р	art of Paper No. 6				

This Office Action is a request for reconsideration filed on May 22, 2000. Currently, Claims 16-63 are pending in this application.

The reissue oath / declaration filed with application is considered defective for reasons of record stated in the Office Action dated February 22, 2000.

Applicant's arguments filed on May 22, 2000 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. While not contesting that the newly added claims are drawn to different inventions from the original patent, Applicant asserts that it is permissible to add claims to other inventions so long as no restriction requirement was made in the original patent. Applicant cites In re Watkinson is support of this position. However, Watkinson is not on point because a restriction requirement was made and error was held to be not correctable. The correct test was set forth in In re Mead³ which stated that the entire disclosure must be considered when determining what Applicant intended to claim and whether the invention now claimed is directed to a different invention (which would not be a correctable error) or some embodiment of the earlier claimed invention (which would be a correctable error). In the instant case, it is clear that the instant claims are not directed to a different embodiment of the original invention since:

- 1) They are directed to a process of making a composition rather than a composition per se.
- 2) The starting materials of the instant process are not the same as the materials set forth in the original compositions claims since the original composition only utilized certain vitamin A derivatives and further required a chelating agent and a water soluble antioxidant while the instant process requires no chelators or antioxidants and broadly claims any retinoid.
- 3) The instant process requires the presence of argon which was not a part of the original claimed invention.

¹i.e. that the addition of such claims is an correctable error for a reissue.

²14 USPQ 2d 1407 (CA FC 1990).

 $^{^3}$ 198 USPQ 412 (CA FC 1978). Note that this case cited In re Rowland, cited by Applicant.

09/360,805 Art Unit 1619

In addition, while the specification sets forth a few specific examples wherein argon was used as a part of the process, there does not appear any intent to claim a process wherein the single process step is the use of argon, i.e. that argon was a critical feature to the retinoid compositions being examined. It is noted that Applicant's listing of the page numbers wherein various embodiments of the claimed invention may be found is not persuasive either of Applicant's intent to file or of written description since the test for both is not when (or if) each individual embodiment was set forth but when the invention (or inventions) as a whole was conveyed.

Thus, there does not appear to be any objective evidence that Applicant originally intended to claim the instant process <u>and</u> the instant claims are now directed to a completely different invention than Applicant originally intended to claim.

In view of the objections to the pending claims set forth above, no claims may be allowed at this time.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 CFR 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

09/360,805 Art Unit 1619

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to the Group 1600 fax machine at 703/308-4556. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30; November 15 1989.

Any inquiry concerning this Office Action or any earlier Office Actions in this application should be directed to Dr. Gary E. Hollinden whose telephone number is 703/308-4521. Dr. Hollinden's office hours are from 6:30 am to 3:00 pm on Monday through Friday.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is 703/308-1235.

Gary E. Hollinden, Ph.D.

Primary Examiner Group 1600